

Integral Consulting Inc. 115 Sansome Street Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94104

telephone: 415.393.4750 www.integral-corp.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Dennis Poma, ACSI

From: Mala Pattanayek and Bridgette DeShields

Date: August 24 2015

Subject: Risk-Based Assessment

Kapalama Military Reservation, Honolulu, HI

Project No.: C493

The purpose of this memorandum is to evaluate whether acceptable risk levels have been achieved for the cleanup of a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) transformer spill at the Kapalama Military Reservation, Building 905, located in Honolulu, Hawaii (the site).

Following guidance from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Hawaii State Department of Health (DOH), potential risk to future commercial/industrial workers from exposure to residual PCBs in soils was evaluated by estimating exposure point concentrations (EPCs) and comparing those EPCs with appropriate risk-based concentrations (RBCs) based on relevant exposure pathways and assumptions. The site soil data and results of comparisons with RBCs are discussed below. Conclusions based on the risk results are also presented.

Details of the site, including background, history, and details of the cleanup effort are presented in the work plan and sampling and analysis plan prepared by ACSI for the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (ACSI 2015) and are not discussed in this memorandum.

SOIL DATA

Soil from the impacted area was removed and confirmation samples were collected and analyzed in April 2015. Samples were collected from the floor of the excavation (at 7 ft below ground surface [bgs]), the ledge, excavation sidewalls (up to 2 ft bgs), asphalt pavement, and the concrete wall. Subsequently, additional soil was removed from the floor (up to 9 ft bgs) and sidewalls, and limited concrete material was also removed.

Risk-Based Assessment — Kapalama August 24, 2015 Page 2 of 5

Confirmation samples following this additional excavation effort were collected and analyzed in July 2015.

Analytical data from both sampling events are presented in Table 1. Aroclor 1260 was detected; no other Aroclors were detected at the laboratory reporting or detection limits. The residual soil data (i.e., the soil currently present onsite) are provided in Table 1 and were used in the risk evaluation. Aroclor 1260 was detected in 8 out of 12 samples, with detected concentrations at or less than 0.23 mg/kg in all of the samples, with the exception of the floor sample (at 9 ft bgs), which had an Aroclor 1260 concentrations of 3.4 mg/kg.

Exposure Point Concentrations

For this evaluation, two EPCs were calculated for PCBs:

- Deep Soil EPC—assumes exposure to soil down to 9 ft bgs; therefore, all residual soil PCB data were included in the EPC calculation.
- Shallow Soil EPC—assumes potential exposure to only shallow soils; therefore, the floor sample at 9 ft bgs was excluded from the EPC calculation.

The EPCs for Aroclor 1260 were calculated following EPA guidance (USEPA 2002). The upper confidence limits (UCLs) on the mean were calculated using ProUCL Software 5.0 (USEPA 2013). For the Deep Soil EPC, the UCL recommended by the program is 3.2 mg/kg and is based on the 99% Kaplan Meier (KM) Chebyshev UCL (see ProUCL Output in Attachment 1). However, based on a review of data, this recommended UCL appears to be skewed high and almost equal to the maximum detected concentration (i.e., the floor sample at 3.4 mg/kg) and, therefore, likely to bias the EPC high. Of the eight samples with detected concentrations of PCBs, seven of the samples have detected concentrations ranging from 0.045 to 0.23 mg/kg, resulting in an arithmetic mean detected concentration of 0.53 mg/kg.

EPA's human health risk assessment guidance considers the 95% UCL on the mean as an appropriate "arithmetic average of the concentration that is contacted over the exposure period" (USEPA 1989). Therefore, for this evaluation, based on the range of detected concentrations, the 95% KM Chebyshev UCL of 1.6 mg/kg was considered appropriate and was selected as the Deep Soil EPC; this EPC is based on the same distribution and statistical method as the program-recommended UCL, but is the 95% UCL instead of the 99% UCL (Attachment 1). This value is likely still biased high (almost an order of magnitude higher than the arithmetic mean).

For a commercial/industrial scenario, the exposure depth evaluated is generally shallow (up to 2 ft bgs). Therefore, exposure to soils deeper than 2 ft bgs is considered unlikely for these receptors. Using only the shallow soil data, the UCL recommended by the program is 0.13 mg/kg based on the 95% KM percentile bootstrap method (Attachment 1). This UCL was selected as the Shallow Soil EPC.

RISK-BASED CONCENTRATIONS

The RBCs for PCBs used to evaluate potential risk to commercial/industrial workers at this site included the following:

- The EPA regional screening level (RSL) of 0.99 mg/kg for Aroclor 1260; this value is based on a target cancer risk of 1×10⁻⁶ (USEPA 2015, updated in June).
- The DOH environmental action level (EAL) of 7.4 mg/kg for total PCBs; this value is based on a target cancer risk of 1×10⁻⁵ (DOH 2011, revised July 2012).

The main difference in the RBCs from the two sources is the target risk; other minor differences include body weight, dermal adherence factor, and skin surface area (this is due to the use of updated exposure parameters by EPA for the June 2015 RSLs).

ESTIMATED RISK

The Shallow Soil and Deep Soil EPCs for PCBs from the site were compared to the RBCs for the commercial/industrial worker scenario. The results are presented in Table 2 and summarized below:

- Shallow Soil—The 95% UCL of 0.13 mg/kg is less than the commercial/industrial EPA RSL of 0.99 mg/kg and the DOH EAL of 7.4 mg/kg. Also, note that this EPC is less than the residential/unrestricted EPA RSL of 0.24 mg/kg and DOH EAL of 1.1 mg/kg. Therefore, risks from exposure to shallow soils are considered acceptable.
- Deep Soil—The 95% UCL of 1.6 mg/kg exceeds the commercial/industrial EPA RSL of 0.99 mg/kg but is less than the DOH EAL of 7.4 mg/kg. A forward risk calculation using this EPC would result in estimated cancer risks of 1.6×10⁻⁶ and 2.2×10⁻⁶, respectively, based on EPA and DOH exposure assumptions. These risks are well within and on the low end of the risk management range of 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻⁶ (USEPA 1991).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the residual concentrations of PCBs in the shallow soils, no unacceptable risks are predicted for the commercial/industrial scenario (as well as the residential/unrestricted scenario).

Although there is an exceedance of the EPA RSL when deeper soils were evaluated, it is unlikely that commercial/industrial workers will be exposed to deep soils for a significant portion of their overall exposure duration. Furthermore, risks estimated inclusive of these deeper soils are likely biased high and on the low end of the risk management range.

Following DOH guidance, a target risk of 1×10⁻⁵ for PCBs is considered appropriate for this scenario; because residual concentrations of PCBs in soil are within this risk range, potential risk to commercial/industrial workers at this site is considered acceptable under DOH guidance.

Based on the statements above, no further evaluation or risk management is recommended for soils with residual PCBs at the site.

REFERENCES

ACSI. 2015. Work Plan and Sampling and Analysis Plan. Kapalama Military Reservation, Building 905. NRC Incident Report # 1110148. Prepared for the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation. ACSI. March 30.

DOH. 2011. Screening for environmental hazards at sites with contaminated soil and groundwater. Hawai'i Department of Health, Environmental Management Division, Honolulu, HI. December.

USEPA. 1989. Risk assessment guidance for Superfund, Volume I, human health evaluation manual (Part A). EPA/540/1-89-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

USEPA. 1991. Role of baseline risk assessment in Superfund remedy selection Decisions. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. PB91-921359. Washington, DC.

USEPA. 2002. Calculating upper confidence limits for exposure point concentrations at hazardous waste sites. OSWER 9285.6-10. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. December.

Risk-Based Assessment — Kapalama August 24, 2015 Page 5 of 5

USEPA. 2013. ProUCL Version 5.0.00 technical guide. Statistical software for environmental applications for data sets with and without nondetect observations. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. September.

USEPA. 2015. Regional screening levels for chemical contaminants at Superfund sites. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. June.

TABLES

Table 1. Analytical Results Summary for Polychlorinated Biphenyls

		Posult (4/16/16	:)	Result (7/24/1	5)	Representative Current Soil Data		
Sample ID	Sample Description	(mg/kg)	Result (4/16/15) (mg/kg)		J)	(mg/kg)	Depth (ft bgs)	
TSF	Floor of Excavation	1.08 ± 0.37		3.4		3.4	9	
LS-1	Ledge Sidewall	0.045	J	-		0.045	2	
LF-1	Ledge Floor	0.23		-		0.23	2	
SSW-1	Excavation Sidewall, Side 1	<0.21	U	-		<0.21	2	
SSW-2	Excavation Sidewall, Side 2	0.01	J	-		0.01	2	
SSW-3	Excavation Sidewall, Side 3	1.1		< 0.07	U	< 0.07	2	
PA-1	Asphalt Pavement, Side 1	0.076	J	-		0.076	2	
PA-2	Asphalt Pavement, Side 2	0.23		-		0.23	2	
PA-3	Asphalt Pavement, Side 3	0.1	J	-		0.1	2	
CW-1	Discrete, Concrete Wall	2.1		< 0.2	U	<0.2	2	
CW-2	Discrete, Concrete Wall	1		0.11	J	0.11	2	
CW-3	Discrete, Concrete Wall	0.4		<0.2	U	<0.2	2	
Summary St	atistics							
Minimum D	etected Concentration					0.045		
Maximum [Detected Concentration					3.4		
Arithmetic I	Mean of Detected Results					0.53		
Standard D	eviation of Detected Results					1.2		

Notes:

ft bgs = feet below ground surface

< = not detected at the method reporting limit reported

Qualified Data:

J = This result is an estimated value

U =The analyte was analyzed for, but was not detected at method reporting limit or method detection limit

Only Aroclor 1260 was detected; no other Aroclors were detected.

^{-- =} not applicable

Table 2. PCB Risk Screening for Commercial/Industrial Worker

Exposure Point Concentr	ations	
Depth	Result (mg/kg)	Based on
Shallow Soil	0.13	95% KM Chebyshev UCL
Deep Soil	1.6	95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL
Risk-Based Concentratio	ns	
Source	Value	Target Cancer Risk
EPA RSL	0.99	1.00E-06
DOH EAL	7.4	1.00E-05
Residual Risk		
Source	Result (mg/kg)	Estimated Cancer Risk
EPA RSL		
Shallow Soil	0.13	1.3E-07
Deep Soil	1.6	1.6E-06
DOH EAL		
Shallow Soil	0.13	1.8E-07
Deep Soil	1.6	2.2E-06

Notes:

exceeds the EPA RSL (but below the DOH EAL)

DOH = Hawaii State Department of Health

EAL = environmental action level

EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

KM = Kaplan Meier

mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram

PCB = polychlorinated biphenyl

RSL = regional screening level

UCL = upper confidence limit

ATTACHMENT 1

PROUCL OUTPUT

User Selected Options

Date/Time of Computation 8/20/2015 10:49:27 AM

From File WorkSheet.xls

Full Precision OFF

Confidence Coefficient 95%

Number of Bootstrap Operations 2000

Conc (pcbs)

General Statistics

Total Number of Observations	12	Number of Distinct Observations	10
Number of Detects	8	Number of Non-Detects	4
Number of Distinct Detects	7	Number of Distinct Non-Detects	3
Minimum Detect	0.01	Minimum Non-Detect	0.07
Maximum Detect	3.4	Maximum Non-Detect	0.21
Variance Detects	1.356	Percent Non-Detects	33.33%
Mean Detects	0.525	SD Detects	1.164
Median Detects	0.105	CV Detects	2.217
Skewness Detects	2.802	Kurtosis Detects	7.888
Mean of Logged Detects	-2.064	SD of Logged Detects	1.664

Normal GOF Test on Detects Only

Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.481	Shapiro Wilk GOF Test
5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.818	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level
Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.475	Lilliefors GOF Test
5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.313	Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level

Detected Data Not Normal at 5% Significance Level

Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs

Mean	0.368	Standard Error of Mean	0.283
SD	0.917	95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.925
95% KM (t) UCL	0.876	95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.908
95% KM (z) UCL	0.833	95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	5.003
90% KM Chebyshev UCL	1.217	95% KM Chebyshev UCL	1.602
97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	2.136	99% KM Chebyshev UCL	3.184

Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only

A-D Test Statistic	0.955	Anderson-Darling GOF Test
5% A-D Critical Value	0.77	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level
K-S Test Statistic	0.365	Kolmogrov-Smirnoff GOF
5% K-S Critical Value	0.311	Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level

Detected Data Not Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level

Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only

0.367	k star (bias corrected MLE)	0.454	k hat (MLE)
1.43	Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	1.156	Theta hat (MLE)
5.876	nu star (bias corrected)	7.268	nu hat (MLE)
0.867	MLE Sd (bias corrected)	0.525	MLE Mean (bias corrected)

Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics

3.86	nu hat (KM)	0.161	k hat (KM)
0.497	Adjusted Chi Square Value (3.86, β)	0.667	Approximate Chi Square Value (3.86, α)
2.859	95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	2.128	95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)

Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects

GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs

GROS may not be used when kstar of detected data is small such as < 0.1

For such situations, GROS method tends to yield inflated values of UCLs and BTVs

For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates

0.353	Mean	0.01	Minimum
0.0605	Median	3.4	Maximum
2.724	CV	0.963	SD
0.324	k star (bias corrected MLE)	0.358	k hat (MLE)
1.09	Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.987	Theta hat (MLE)
7.78	nu star (bias corrected)	8.595	nu hat (MLE)
0.621	MLE Sd (bias corrected)	0.353	MLE Mean (bias corrected)
0.029	Adjusted Level of Significance (β)		
2.174	Adjusted Chi Square Value (7.78, β)	2.608	Approximate Chi Square Value (7.78, α)
1.265	95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	1.054	95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)

Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only

Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.928	Shapiro Wilk GOF Test
5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.818	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level
Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.236	Lilliefors GOF Test
5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.313	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level

Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level

Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects

Mean in Original Scale	0.364	Mean in Log Scale	-2.485
SD in Original Scale	0.959	SD in Log Scale	1.506
95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.861	95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.91
95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	1.194	95% Bootstrap t UCL	5.206
95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	1.53		

UCLs using Lognormal Distribution and KM Estimates when Detected data are Lognormally Distributed

KM Mean (logged)	-2.474	95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	1.506
KM SD (logged)	1.499	95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	3.894
KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.509		

DL/2 Statistics

DL/2 Normal	DL/2 Log-Transformed			
Mean in Original Scale	0.378	Mean in Log Scale	-2.227	
SD in Original Scale	0.954	SD in Log Scale	1.378	
95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.873	95% H-Stat UCL	1.267	

DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons

Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics

Detected Data appear Lognormal Distributed at 5% Significance Level

Suggested UCL to Use

99% KM (Chebyshev) UCL 3.184

Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.

Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.

These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).

However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.

ProUCL Output for Shallow Soil (excluding floor sample at 9 ft bgs)

User Selected Options

Date/Time of Computation 8/20/2015 2:49:18 PM

From File ProUCL Input.xls

Full Precision OFF

Confidence Coefficient 95%

Number of Bootstrap Operations 2000

Conc (pcbs)

General Statistics

		G01101G1 G	
9	Number of Distinct Observations	11	Total Number of Observations
4	Number of Non-Detects	7	Number of Detects
3	Number of Distinct Non-Detects	6	Number of Distinct Detects
0.07	Minimum Non-Detect	0.01	Minimum Detect
0.21	Maximum Non-Detect	0.23	Maximum Detect
36.36%	Percent Non-Detects	0.00736	Variance Detects
0.0858	SD Detects	0.114	Mean Detects
0.75	CV Detects	0.1	Median Detects
-1.079	Kurtosis Detects	0.575	Skewness Detects
1.083	SD of Logged Detects	-2.533	Mean of Logged Detects

Normal GOF Test on Detects Only

Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.888	Shapiro Wilk GOF Test
5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.803	Detected Data appear Normal at 5% Significance Level
Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.235	Lilliefors GOF Test
5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.335	Detected Data appear Normal at 5% Significance Level

Detected Data appear Normal at 5% Significance Level

Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics using Normal Critical Values and other Nonparametric UCLs

Mean	0.0921	Standard Error of Mean	0.0253
SD	0.0733	95% KM (BCA) UCL	0.135
95% KM (t) UCL	0.138	95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL	0.134
95% KM (z) UCL	0.134	95% KM Bootstrap t UCL	0.142
90% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.168	95% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.202
97.5% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.25 Page 1 of 3	99% KM Chebyshev UCL	0.344

Integral Consulting, Inc.,

ProUCL Output for Shallow Soil (excluding floor sample at 9 ft bgs)

Gamma GOF Tests on Detected Observations Only

A-D Test Statistic	0.289	Anderson-Darling GOF Test
5% A-D Critical Value	0.721	Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level
K-S Test Statistic	0.176	Kolmogrov-Smirnoff GOF
5% K-S Critical Value	0.317	Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level

Detected data appear Gamma Distributed at 5% Significance Level

Gamma Statistics on Detected Data Only

k hat (MLE)	1.513	k star (bias corrected MLE)	0.96
Theta hat (MLE)	0.0756	Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.119
nu hat (MLE)	21.19	nu star (bias corrected)	13.44
MLE Mean (bias corrected)	0.114	MLE Sd (bias corrected)	0.117

Gamma Kaplan-Meier (KM) Statistics

34.68	nu hat (KM)	1.576	k hat (KM)
20.59	Adjusted Chi Square Value (34.68, β)	22.21	Approximate Chi Square Value (34.68, α)
0.155	95% Gamma Adjusted KM-UCL (use when n<50)	0.144	95% Gamma Approximate KM-UCL (use when n>=50)

Gamma ROS Statistics using Imputed Non-Detects

GROS may not be used when data set has > 50% NDs with many tied observations at multiple DLs

GROS may not be used when kstar of detected data is small such as < 0.1

For such situations, GROS method tends to yield inflated values of UCLs and BTVs

For gamma distributed detected data, BTVs and UCLs may be computed using gamma distribution on KM estimates

0.0917	Mean	0.01	Minimum
0.076	Median	0.23	Maximum
0.816	CV	0.0748	SD
1.267	k star (bias corrected MLE)	1.658	k hat (MLE)
0.0724	Theta star (bias corrected MLE)	0.0553	Theta hat (MLE)
27.86	nu star (bias corrected)	36.48	nu hat (MLE)
0.0814	MLE Sd (bias corrected)	0.0917	MLE Mean (bias corrected)
0.0278	Adjusted Level of Significance (β)		
15.44	Adjusted Chi Square Value (27.86, β)	16.82	Approximate Chi Square Value (27.86, α)
0.165	95% Gamma Adjusted UCL (use when n<50)	0.152	95% Gamma Approximate UCL (use when n>=50)

ProUCL Output for Shallow Soil (excluding floor sample at 9 ft bgs)

Lognormal GOF Test on Detected Observations Only

Shapiro Wilk Test Statistic	0.888	Shapiro Wilk GOF Test
5% Shapiro Wilk Critical Value	0.803	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level
Lilliefors Test Statistic	0.198	Lilliefors GOF Test
5% Lilliefors Critical Value	0.335	Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level

Detected Data appear Lognormal at 5% Significance Level

Lognormal ROS Statistics Using Imputed Non-Detects

Mean in Original Scale	0.0879	Mean in Log Scale	-2.797
SD in Original Scale	0.0766	SD in Log Scale	0.949
95% t UCL (assumes normality of ROS data)	0.13	95% Percentile Bootstrap UCL	0.127
95% BCA Bootstrap UCL	0.131	95% Bootstrap t UCL	0.164
95% H-UCL (Log ROS)	0.228		

UCLs using Lognormal Distribution and KM Estimates when Detected data are Lognormally Distributed

KM Mean (logged)	-2.81	95% H-UCL (KM -Log)	0.289
KM SD (logged)	1.047	95% Critical H Value (KM-Log)	3.088
KM Standard Error of Mean (logged)	0.414		

DL/2 Statistics

DL/2 Normal		DL/2 Log-Transformed		
Mean in Original Scale	0.104	Mean in Log Scale	- 2.54	
SD in Original Scale	0.0705	SD in Log Scale	0.888	
95% t UCL (Assumes normality)	0.142	95% H-Stat UCL	0.256	

DL/2 is not a recommended method, provided for comparisons and historical reasons

Nonparametric Distribution Free UCL Statistics

Detected Data appear Normal Distributed at 5% Significance Level

Suggested UCL to Use

95% KM (t) UCL 0.138 95% KM (Percentile Bootstrap) UCL 0.134

Note: Suggestions regarding the selection of a 95% UCL are provided to help the user to select the most appropriate 95% UCL.

Recommendations are based upon data size, data distribution, and skewness.

These recommendations are based upon the results of the simulation studies summarized in Singh, Maichle, and Lee (2006).

However, simulations results will not cover all Real World data sets; for additional insight the user may want to consult a statistician.

Page 3 of 3